UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,879	04/16/2004	Balasubrahmanyam Gattu	2003.10.006.WS0	1446

23990 7590 08/05/2009

DOCKET CLERK
P.O. DRAWER 800889
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
GREENE, JOSEPH L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2451	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/826,879	GATTU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOSEPH L. GREENE	2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 24 are currently pending in this application.

2. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are emended as filed on 04/07/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 and 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gieseke et al. (Pre-Grant Publication No. US 2003/0069955 A1), hereinafter Gieseke, in view of Lavian et al. (Patent No. US 7,433,941 B1), hereinafter Lavian, and in view of Applicant's own Admitted Prior-Art, hereinafter AAPA.

5. With respect to claim 1, Gieseke taught a system **for use in a communication network, a first object-oriented device** (0012, lines 1-6) **capable of communicating with an object-oriented device in said communication network** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device)**, said first object-oriented device comprising: processing circuitry executing a plurality of objects, said processing circuitry associated with said first object-oriented**

telecommunication device (0012, lines 1-11)**; and an object conduit management information base (MIB) manager** (0042, lines 1-10, where the SNMP Agent or the configuration server both perform the tasks of the conduit MIB i.e. gathering, parsing, mapping, and conveying data from MIB objects and transferring the data to another MIB object) **capable of gathering data from one or more of said plurality of objects and generating therefrom a management information base (MIB) data structure** (0042, lines 19-22) **suitable for communicating with said object-oriented device using a specified protocol interface** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device. Furthermore, it is inherent that there will be a specific protocol for use in a network)**.**

Gieseke also taught **wherein a first object of said plurality of objects is capable of invoking a method of an object executable by processing circuitry associated with said second object-oriented telecommunication device using said MIB data structure** (0011, lines 1-6, where the configuration input data is send from the first object-oriented device and received at the second object-oriented device. In responding to the request for configuration information, a method is being invoked in the second object-oriented device. Since the request was transferred from the first object-oriented device, the first object-oriented device invoked a method in the second object-oriented device) **representing a plurality of objects in said object-oriented telecommunication device** (0011, lines 1-6).

However, while Gieseke taught manipulating a plurality of objects within an object oriented device, Gieseke did not explicitly state a first device invoking methods

and communicating with a second device. On the other hand, Lavian did teach a first device invoking methods and communicating with a second device (column 4, lines 18-26 and column 5, lines 6-11, where the first device invoked the method in the second device that told it to return the information about the connected terminal). Both the systems Gieseke and Lavian are directed towards managing SNMP devices and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gieseke with remote access of another device, as taught by Lavian, in order to apply direct use to Gieseke's SNMP agents and thus; provide a more marketable product.

While the combination of Gieseke and Lavian did not explicitly state the device being a telecommunication device, the elements listed can be used for that purpose. Furthermore, AAPA did teach telecommunication devices (0004, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill, in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of Gieseke and Lavian in order to perform telecommunication tasks, as taught by AAPA. Telecommunication is and was a highly sought after field in computer networks. Setting up a telecommunication network would likely have been one of the uses for the system taught by Gieseke even though it wasn't directly disclosed.

6. As for claim 2, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 1 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said specified protocol interface is Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)** (0010, lines 1-3).

7. As for claim 3, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 1 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises an object identifier (ID) associated with a target object in said second object-oriented telecommunication device** (0050, lines 6-8).

8. As for claim 4, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 3 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises a target method 1D** (0050, lines 6-8) **identifying a selected method associated with said target object and at least one method parameter associated with said selected method** (0050, lines 8-14).

9. As for claim 5, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 4 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit MIB manager comprises an interface controller** (0042, lines 6-10, where configuration objects act as an interface controller) **capable of communicating with said one or more of said plurality of objects and gathering said data from said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0012, lines 1-11).

10. As for claim 6, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 1 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit management information base (MIB) manager is further capable of receiving a response MIB data structure from said**

second object-oriented telecommunication device (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device), **extracting data from said response MIB data structure** (0042, lines 10-15), **and distributing said extracted data to said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0012, lines 1-11).

11. With respect to claim 13, Gieseke taught **a communication network comprising: a first object-oriented device** (0012, lines 1-6) **capable of communicating with an object-oriented device in said communication network** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device)**, said first object-oriented device comprising: processing circuitry executing a plurality of objects, said processing circuitry associated with said first object-oriented telecommunication device** (0012, lines 1-11)**; and an object conduit management information base (MIB) manager** (0042, lines 1-10, where the SNMP Agent or the configuration server both perform the tasks of the conduit MIB i.e. gathering, parsing, mapping, and conveying data from MIB objects and transferring the data to another MIB object) **capable of gathering data from one or more of said plurality of objects and generating therefrom a management information base (MIB) data structure** (0042, lines 19-22) **suitable for communicating with said object-oriented device using a specified protocol interface** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device. Furthermore, it is inherent that there will be a specific protocol for use in a network)**.**

Gieseke also taught **wherein a first object of said plurality of objects is capable of invoking a method of an object executable by processing circuitry associated with said second object-oriented telecommunication device using said MIB data structure** (0011, lines 1-6, where the configuration input data is send from the first object-oriented device and received at the second object-oriented device. In responding to the request for configuration information, a method is being invoked in the second object-oriented device. Since the request was transferred from the first object-oriented device, the first object-oriented device invoked a method in the second object-oriented device) **representing a plurality of objects in said object-oriented telecommunication device** (0011, lines 1-6).

However, while Gieseke taught manipulating a plurality of objects within an object oriented device, Gieseke did not explicitly state a first device invoking methods and communicating with a second device. On the other hand, Lavian did teach a first device invoking methods and communicating with a second device (column 4, lines 18-26 and column 5, lines 6-11, where the first device invoked the method in the second device that told it to return the information about the connected terminal). Both the systems Gieseke and Lavian are directed towards managing SNMP devices and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Gieseke with remote access of another device, as taught by Lavian, in order to apply direct use to Gieseke's SNMP agents and thus; provide a more marketable product.

While the combination of Gieseke and Lavian did not explicitly state the device being a telecommunication device, the elements listed can be used for that purpose. Furthermore, AAPA did teach telecommunication devices (0004, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill, in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of Gieseke and Lavian in order to perform telecommunication tasks, as taught by AAPA. Telecommunication is and was a highly sought after field in computer networks. Setting up a telecommunication network would likely have been one of the uses for the system taught by Gieseke even though it wasn't directly disclosed.

12. As for claim 14, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 13 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said specified protocol interface is Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)** (0010, lines 1-3).

13. As for claim 15, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 13 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises an object identifier (ID) associated with a target object in said second object-oriented telecommunication device** (0050, lines 6-8).

14. As for claim 16, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 15 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises a target method ID** (0050, lines 6-8) **identifying a selected method associated with said target object**

and at least one method parameter associated with said selected method (0050, lines 8-14).

15. As for claim 17, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 16 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit MIB manager comprises an interface controller** (0042, lines 6-10, where configuration objects act as an interface controller) **capable of communicating with said one or more of said plurality of objects and gathering said data from said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0012, lines 1-11).

16. As for claim 18, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 13 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit management information base (MIB) manager** (0042, lines 1-10, where the SNMP agent and configuration server carries out the job of the conduit MIB) **is further capable of receiving a response MIB data structure from said second object-oriented telecommunication device** (0011, lines 1-6, where each device is capable of receiving and responding)**, extracting data from said response MIB data structure, and distributing said extracted data to said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0042, lines 10-15).

17. As for claim 19, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 13 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said second object-oriented telecommunication device** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device)

comprises: a plurality of objects executable by processing circuitry associated with said second object-oriented telecommunication device (0012, lines 1-11); **and an object conduit management information base (MIB) agent capable of receiving said management information base (MIB) data structure from said first object-oriented telecommunication device** (0042, lines 1-10, where the SNMP Agent or the configuration server both perform the tasks of the conduit MIB), **extracting data from said received MIB data structure (0042, lines 10-15), and distributing said extracted data to one or more of said plurality of objects** (0012, lines 1-11).

18. As for claim 20, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 19 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said specified protocol interface is Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)** (0010, lines 1-3).

19. As for claim 21, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 19 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises an object identifier (ID)** (0050, lines 6-8) **associated with a target one of said one or more of said plurality of objects in said first object-oriented telecommunication device** (0012, lines 1-11, where the information listed is the pointed to plurality of objects).

20. As for claim 22, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 21 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises a target method ID** (0050, lines 6-8) **identifying a selected method associated with said target object**

and at least one method parameter associated with said selected method (0050, lines 8-14).

21. As for claim 23, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 22 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit MIB agent comprises an interface controller** (0042, lines 6-10, where configuration objects act as an interface controller) **capable of communicating with said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0011, lines 1-6, where responding is communicating) **and distributing said extracted data to said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0042, lines 10-15).

22. As for claim 24, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 19 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit MIB agent** (0042, lines 1-10, where the SNMP agent and configuration server perform the operations of the conduit MIB) **is further capable of gathering data from said one or more of said plurality of objects in said second object-oriented telecommunication devices** (0012, lines 1-11) **and generating therefrom a response management information base (MIB) data structure** (0042, lines 19-22) **suitable for communicating with said first object-oriented device using a specified protocol interface** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device. Furthermore, it is inherent that there will be a specific protocol for use in a network).

23. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gieseke, and in view of AAPA.

24. With respect to claim 7, Gieseke taught a system **for use in a communication network, a first object-oriented device** (0012, lines 1-6) **capable of communicating with an object-oriented device in said communication network** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device)**, said first object-oriented device comprising: processing circuitry executing a plurality of objects, said processing circuitry associated with said first object-oriented telecommunication device** (0012, lines 1-11)**; and an object conduit management information base (MIB) manager** (0042, lines 1-10, where the SNMP Agent or the configuration server both perform the tasks of the conduit MIB i.e. gathering, parsing, mapping, and conveying data from MIB objects and transferring the data to another MIB object) **capable of receiving a management information base (MIB) data structure from said object-oriented telecommunication device using a specified protocol interface** (0011, lines 1-6, where the responding is the communicating with the first device. Furthermore, it is inherent that there will be a specific protocol for use in a network)**, extracting data from said received MIB data structure (0042, lines 10-15), and distributing said extracted data to one or more of said plurality of objects** (0012, lines 1-11).

Gieseke also taught **wherein said object conduit MIB agent is capable of invoking a method of a first object of said plurality of objects using said MIB data**

structure (0011, lines 1-6, where the configuration input data is sent from the first object-oriented device and received at the second object-oriented device. In responding to the request for configuration information, a method is being invoked in the second object-oriented device. Since the request was transferred from the first object-oriented device, the first object-oriented device invoked a method in the second object-oriented device).

While Gieseke did not explicitly state the device being a telecommunication device, the elements listed can be used for that purpose. Furthermore, AAPA did teach telecommunication devices (0004, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill, in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of Gieseke and Lavian in order to perform telecommunication tasks, as taught by AAPA. Telecommunication is and was a highly sought after field in computer networks. Setting up a telecommunication network would likely have been one of the uses for the system taught by Gieseke even though it wasn't directly disclosed.

25. As for claim 8, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 7 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said specified protocol interface is Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)** (0010, lines 1-3).

26. As for claim 9, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 7 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises an object identifier (ID)** (0050, lines 6-8) **associated with a target one of said one or more of said plurality**

of objects in said first object-oriented telecommunication device (0012, lines 1-11, where the information listed is the pointed to plurality of objects).

27. As for claim 10, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 9 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said MIB data structure comprises a target method ID** (0050, lines 6-8) **identifying a selected method associated with said target object and at least one method parameter associated with said selected method** (0050, lines 8-14).

28. As for claim 11, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 10 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit MIB agent comprises an interface controller** (0042, lines 6-10, where configuration objects act as an interface controller) **capable of communicating with said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0011, lines 1-6, where responding is communicating) **and distributing said extracted data to said one or more of said plurality of objects** (0042, lines 10-15).

29. As for claim 12, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 7 above. In addition, Gieseke taught **wherein said object conduit MIB agent is further capable of gathering data from said one or more of said plurality of objects and generating therefrom a response management information base (MIB) data structure** (0042, lines 19-22) **suitable for communicating with said second object-oriented telecommunication device using said specified protocol interface** (0011, lines 1-6,

where the responding is the communicating with the first device. Furthermore, it is inherent that there will be a specific protocol for use in a network).

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments filed 04/07/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

31. The applicant argues on page 13 that "**Gieseke describes a network element that includes SNMP agent having an object model of components of the network element itself. *See Gieseke, [0042], [0044] and [0045].* The Applicants submit that Gieseke does not describe a network element that includes a MIB data structure representing objects in another network element, as recited in Claim 1.**" However, it is known that Gieseke did not explicitly state the MIB representing objects in another network element. Thus, Lavian was used to show the aforementioned feature. To provide more clarification, Lavian's column 4, lines 38-44 shows that the manipulated objects are represented by MIBs.

32. The applicant also argues on pages 14 and 15 that "**First, as may be seen above, paragraph [0042] includes no teaching that "the SNMP Agent or the configuration server both perform the tasks of the conduit MIB i.e. gathering, parsing, mapping, and conveying data from MIB objects and transferring the data to another MIB object," as asserted by the Examiner. If such teaching is to be**

found in Gieseke, it must be in a portion of the reference not cited by the Examiner. Second, as may be seen above, paragraph [0011] includes no teaching of a response, much less "where the responding is the communicating with the first device," as asserted by the Examiner. If such teaching is to be found in Gieseke, it must be in a portion of the reference not cited by the Examiner. Third, the Examiner asserts that paragraph [0042], lines 10B 15, describe extracting data from a received MIB data structure. As may be seen above, paragraph [0042] has only ten lines. Fourth, as may be seen above, paragraph [0012] includes no teaching of distributing extracted data to one or more of said plurality of objects, as asserted by the Examiner. If such teaching is to be found in Gieseke, it must be in a portion of the reference not cited by the Examiner."

However, firstly, gathering can be found in the cited portions of the reference. More particularly, it can be seen between lines 10 and 15. Further classification may also be found in section 0047, lines 12-17, which shows that the data is from an MIB. Secondly, section 0011, on lines 5 and 6, states "responding to requests for configuration information." Thirdly, the applicant's arguments are not clear as section 0042 of the Pre-Grant Publication (as stated as the reference in the office action), has 22 lines. Lastly, section 0012, lines 6-9, clearly shows that the configuration information is read. Thus, it was distributed to the devices such that it could be read.

Conclusion

33. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH L. GREENE whose telephone number is (571)270-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLG

/Hassan Phillips/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451